New-York Tribune.

Vol. XXXV.....No. 10,856. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 15, 1876.—TRIPLE SHEET. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

WASHINGTON.

A DRAWN BATTLE ON AMNESTY.

THE DEBATE DEVOTED TO BRILLIANT SKIRMISHING—MR. RANDALL'S AND MR. BLAINE'S MEASURES AGAIN BOTH FAIL.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Jan. 14.—Mr. Randall's parliamentary tactics succeeded to-day, so far as to enable him to get the Amnesty bill once more before the House but he was again beaten by Mr. Blaine when he attempted to pass it. Friday is, under the rules, private bill day in the House. That is, on that day committees are called upon for reports on private bills, and generally the whole session is occupied with business brought in by one or two committees; but committees have as yet done so little business that when the list was called through only three or four bills were reported, so that the matter was soon disposed of. The next thing in order was a call of committees for general business, and it was supposed that it would proceed almost without interruption until the Committee on the Judiciary was reached, when the Amnesty bill with Mr. Banks's amendment would be reported back, and Mr. Randall would have it once more before the House and in his control. But the Committee on Public Lands occupied considerable time with its business, so that when the Judiciary Committee was reached it was after 2 o'clock.

J. Proctor Knott reported the bill and called the previous question. This was seconded without opposition, although Mr. Blaine asked permission to offer an amendment. This was refused, and the Yeas and Nays were called on ordering the main question. This was a sort of preliminary skirmishing, sought by both sides in order to ascertain their strength, since, as this motion required only a majority vote, there could be no doubt of its success. Several Republicans, among them Messrs. Seelye, Kelley, Morey, and Pierce, and several colored Representatives from the South, and Gen. Banks and other Liberals, voted with the majority. While the main question was ordered, the vote showed that one less than two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

If this vote could have been held, the bill would have been passed, since there were several Democrats who had not voted, and who could be brought in before the next roll-call; but Mr. Blaine was determined to defeat the bill unless he could get a vote on his Jefferson Davis amendment, and the only way to do it was to prevent the Republicans from voting for it. Of course it would have been idle for him to have proposed such a thing to such men as Messrs. Seelye, Pierce, Kelley, and Morey; but with colored men it was different; and during the next roll-call there was no busier or more earnest man in the House than the ex-Speaker. There was probably not a single colored Representative whom he did not appeal to, and at times he had them gathered around him, while he stood in the midst arguing the question in a very earnest manner. He converted the most of them. Mr. Haralson, an old negro of pure African blood, voted for the bill, and was loudly applauded by the Democrats. Two or three others attempted to explain that they were in favor of amnesty, but were prevented, except Mr. Lynch, who said that he was opposed to Mr. Blaine's amendment, but voted against the bill to enable Mr. Blaine to offer the amendment. The bill was lost, as it lacked four votes of two-thirds.

Mr. Blaine immediately moved to reconsider, but as it turned out, his only object was to get a chance to read a letter from ex-Gov. Holden of North Carolina, and make a proposition to the other side. Ex-Gov. Holden's letter called attention to the fact that he had been placed under political disabilities by the Democrats of his State; and Mr. Blaine, evidently forgetting Holden's ante-bellum and Confederate record, tried to make a Union martyr of him. Had he given any one on the other side an opportunity to reply he would have got the worst of it, but that he did not do. After asking unanimous consent to introduce his substitute, agreeing to allow amendments, to which objection was made by Mr. Randall, he withdrew his motion to reconsider. The bill was again dead for to-day.

MR. BLAINE CRITICISED.

THE GENERAL COMMENT IN WASHINGTON—HE GAINS POPULARITY ONLY AMONG THE ULTRA-RADICAL REPUBLICANS—INCONSISTENCY OF HIS RECORD.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Jan. 14.—"Mr. Blaine has crippled the Democratic party and injured himself by his course in regard to the Amnesty bill," is the almost universal comment made in Washington. The only portion of the Republican party with whom Mr. Blaine has gained popularity during the past week is the ultra-Radical wing, most largely represented in the South, which is already leaning toward Senator Morton as a candidate for the Presidency, if it is not in fact committed to him. Mr. Blaine's performances since Monday are very generally characterized as those of a demagogue and not those of a statesman. "I came to Washington," said one of the clearest-headed and most liberal-minded of the Democrats to-day, "looking upon Blaine as the future leader of the Republican party. If that party was to remain in power, I preferred to see him elevated to the position of standard-bearer; and if it was to be defeated, I thought that under his leadership the minority would be so skillfully marshalled as to keep the majority watchful and careful of its policy and its acts. But day by day my estimate of Blaine has been lowered. His whole course since Monday has not appeared to me like that of a sincere man. I do not, of course, deny his great ability, his splendid powers of oratory, or the possession of those qualities which fit him to be a leader on the floor of the House; but every day he seems to me less and less a statesman and more and more a politician."

In the light of the action taken by the House of Representatives in the last Congress, the course pursued by Mr. Blaine is indefensible. Then an amnesty bill, without exceptions and without conditions, was reported unanimously from a committee controlled by the Republicans, and of which Mr. Blaine was chairman. It was passed by the House, no opportunity being given for debate or amendment. No new light has been gained on the subject since; no good reason exists now for making an exception against Jeff. Davis which did not then exist and which was not then known. Mr. Blaine, if he was opposed to the bill in the form in which it was then presented, as he now says he was, did not make that opposition known. The fact that he was Speaker did not prevent him from doing so. He might have left the chair and taken the floor for that purpose. He might have secured the services of some other member to do it for him, or, as presiding officer, he might have thrown obstacles in the way of its passage for the moment, until he could have an opportunity to make his opposition known. But he did none of these things. For these reasons the Democrats hold that his course has been wholly inexcusable.

The only gain which the Republicans have made by the character of their opposition to the Amnesty bill has been their success in placing Democrats in what the latter assert to be a false light before the country. Mr. Hill of Georgia has, ever since the war, been one of the least conservative of the Southern leaders. The tone and character of his speech, especially those parts of it in which he treated the origin of the war and the relations between the North and South at the time it broke out, do not meet the approval of the great body of the Democratic members, and they deeply regret that he ever gave utterance to such sentiments. The scenes of the past week are likely to be repeated often during the present session. Four years ago the scene of Presidential campaign, so far as it was fought out in Congress, was the Senate Chamber; this year the House will be the arena in which the skirmishing preliminary to the great contest which is to follow will take place, if some of its great battles are not fought there, and political debates are likely to occupy a great portion of the time.

DISSATISFIED REPUBLICANS.

HOW SENATOR MORTON MANIPULATED THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE—ANGRY COMMENTS ON THE ACTION FIXING CINCINNATI AS THE PLACE OF THE CONVENTION.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Jan. 14.—There is a good deal of angry comment here among Pennsylvanians and others who are opposed to Cincinnati as the city in which to hold the Republican National Convention regarding the manner in which it is alleged Mr. Morton and his friends manipulated the Executive Committee. These persons say that Mr. Morton not only acted indelicately, being himself a candidate, in serving on the Committee at all, but that it was unfair in him to become the advocate of a place supposed to be favorable to his ambition. Comment even goes so far as to say he packed the Committee in his own interest. Six of Mr. Morton's colleagues were present, either as principals or substitutes, actively working in his interest—namely, Messrs. Clayton of Arkansas, Ingalls of Kansas, Mitchell of Oregon, Spencer of Alabama, Conover of Florida, and Patterson of South Carolina, and, in addition, United States Treasurer New of Indiana served as proxy for Wyoming, and another friend as proxy for Colorado. According to members of the Committee he had every carpet-bag vote except that of Marshal Packard of Louisiana, who was in favor of Philadelphia, because he thought that was a good place for the "third-term" plant to take root.

The number of votes before Mr. Morton's victory was declared showed that the fight was long and bitter, and it is claimed that had not the Indiana Senator been present in person he would have lost. Mr. Spencer is an acknowledged and open third-termer, and it was his desire to join the third-term host for Gen. Grant and Philadelphia; but Mr. Morton is the Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that Committee is charged with the investigation of the manner in which Mr. Spencer became a Senator. Gov. Claflin of Massachusetts voted steadily with Mr. Morton, to the surprise of some of his friends.

It is thought that Philadelphia would have had a larger vote than Chicago on the next ballot, and would ultimately have been chosen, had it not been for Wm. H. Kemble, the Pennsylvania member of the Committee, who, it is charged by Philadelphians, deserted his friends at the request of Mr. Cameron, who said to the Philadelphians that he did not want to antagonize Mr. Morton.

CURRENT TOPICS AT THE CAPITAL.

AN ALABAMA CLAIMS REVIEW.

WASHINGTON, Friday, Jan. 14, 1876.

The House Judiciary Committee, to whom was referred certain bills relating to the payment of the judgments of the Court of Commissioners of Alabama Claims, made a report to-day as follows: The aggregate of the claims presented is \$12,673,451 44. Of this aggregate the Court had disposed of before Jan. 1, 1876, \$9,704,608 65, leaving unadjudicated \$2,968,842 79. The Court has rendered payments amounting of principal to \$4,393,525 11, and of interest, \$2,051,070 72; aggregate of judgments and interest, \$6,444,592 83. Assuming that claims upon which the judgments are yet to be rendered will be reduced in the ratio of less than one-half of the claims already passed upon, the whole amount, including interest, to be paid, and allowing \$1,300,000 for claims not proved (should Congress allow any further proof), will not exceed \$10,000,000. The present value of the Alabama fund, in currency, is about \$20,000,000. No question is made in any quarter that the debts provable have precedence over any other claims; and if it should hereafter be held that the United States are not controlled in the disposition of the sum awarded by the Tribunal of Arbitration, by the views expressed by such tribunal, then it would of course follow that the disposition of a portion or the whole of the sum so awarded would be within the power of Congress. The priority of the claims provable being conceded and established, and the duration of the court having been from time to time extended, it would seem to be unjust to require the claimants, in whose favor judgments are rendered, to wait until "the conclusion of the business of the court," as provided in the original act. The Committee therefore reported a bill in accordance with this view of the case, which was passed by the House.

THE MEXICAN RAIDS COMMITTEE.

Mr. Schleicher's committee to investigate the troubles on the Rio Grande border held its first meeting this morning. No actual business was transacted, but, from the general conversation which took place among the members of the Committee, it is believed that they will not deem it necessary to make a very extended investigation. The general opinion seems to be that sufficient evidence of outrages, both by Indians and by Mexicans, is already in the hands of Congress, and that if any additional testimony is needed it can be obtained from the War Department. Several gentlemen from Brownsville are expected in Washington soon, and they will be able to give testimony if it is needed. If no investigation is made, the work of the Committee will be greatly simplified, and will consist chiefly in advising measures of relief to be proposed to Congress. Those measures will probably be in the form of a bill or resolution advising the President to station a larger and more effective military force upon the Rio Grande border. The Committee will hold another meeting on Monday morning.

A QUAINT CIVIL SERVICE IDEA.

Mr. Willard of Michigan introduced a bill in the House this afternoon looking to an important reform in the Civil Service. Its title is "A bill to preserve the prerogatives of the executive departments of the Government," and it makes it a misdemeanor for any Senator, Representative, or Delegate in Congress to interfere, advise, or recommend the appointment or removal of any officer under any of the executive departments, unless he is requested to do so by the President or a head of department or bureau; and that, when such advice is so asked, he shall give it in writing with his reasons, among which there shall be none based on personal or political grounds. All such letters written by members of Congress on the request of an executive officer are by the bill required to be placed on file and to be produced at any time when called for by Congress. The penalty for violating the provisions of the bill is a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000. Mr. Willard will attempt at an early day to get the sense of the House on the subject of Civil Service reform.

WASHINGTON NOTES.

WASHINGTON, Friday, Jan. 14, 1876.

The Democratic House will find one Cabinet officer willing to meet them half way in their efforts to cut down appropriations. Mr. Jewell says if the Committee can find any useless expenditures in his Department he will be very glad to cut them off without the interposition of the House Committee now preparing to make a thorough inquiry into the Department. One subject of special investigation will be whether the fast mail trains are of sufficient advantage to warrant the cost. It is a favorite scheme of Mr. Jewell, and the question will have a thorough trial. The members of the House are already beginning to talk about the tariff, and the sentiment seems to be general that a heavy revision will be made in accordance with Democratic traditions. It is understood that the question of just what shall be done will be settled by the caucus to be called by the Ways and Means Committee as soon as the appropriation bills are fairly along.

When Mr. Blaine yesterday accused Mr. Cox of delivering one speech in the House and publishing a different one, he alluded to the report as revised for and published in *The Congressional Record*.

(*For Regular Report of Congressional Proceedings, see Second Page.*)

ANTI-TAMMANY PRIMARIES.

The Anti-Tammany voters held primary elections throughout the city last evening for the purpose of electing delegates to form the new County Committee for the present year. Two delegates were chosen from each election district in the various Assembly districts, and, so far as could be ascertained, the primaries passed off without any serious disturbances. Among the delegates elected were the following: Emanuel B. Hart, Francis M. Bixby, Dr. Feodor Mierson, John D Coughlin, John C. Rushnell, Dr. F. Seeger, Julius G. Lombard, Michael Healy, Henry E. Lynch, ex-Judge John M. Barber, O. Curtis Hoffman, Joseph Koch, Max Moses, James Cunningham, Charles H. Lyons, John Egan, Henry Murray, George Plunkett, J. J. Cogge, Jerome Buck, James R. McKenzie, Charles G. Crary, James Sullivan, John Hart, Thomas J. McKellar, James D. McClelland, Thomas J. Creamer, Ira Shafer, Rufus F. Andrews, Dennis McMahon, Denis Burns, John Callagan, John Morrissey, S. H. Turnbull, Thomas Carrol, John S. Bussing, James B. Sheridan, and Judge Van Hoesen.

GENERAL FOREIGN NEWS.

CHURCH AND STATE IN GERMANY

LONDON, Friday, Jan. 14, 1876.

The Morning Standard's Berlin special telegram says it would seem that an armistice has certainly been agreed upon between the Church and State. The Roman correspondent of *The Germania* (Ultramontane organ) states that undoubtedly Prince Bismarck is seeking a *modus vivendi* with the Vatican. *The Italia*, a semi-official Roman newspaper, says that the Vatican has charged certain German prelates to report the conditions under which the Prussian bishops shall be allowed to submit to the Falk laws.

FRENCH AFFAIRS.

PARIS, Friday, Jan. 14, 1876.

The *Republique Française* (the organ of M. Gambetta) regards the proclamation of President MacMahon yesterday as a confirmation of Republican institutions.

The Council-General of the Department of Seine have nominated for the Senate Messrs. Victor Hugo, Louis Blanc, Floquet, Freycinet, and Tolain.

M. Leon Say has instructed his subordinate officials in the Finance Ministry not to connect themselves with the electoral agitation, to vote according to their convictions, but not to participate in any manifestations either before or after the elections.

Sir John H. Glover, the newly appointed Governor of Newfoundland, has arrived in Paris for the purpose of settling the differences between England and France in regard to the Newfoundland fisheries. It is believed that he is authorized to purchase the relinquishment by France of her privileges for a considerable sum of money.

TURKEY AND THE GREAT POWERS.

ST. PETERSBURG, Friday, Jan 14, 1876.

It is semi-officially stated that the Porte has now ceased its endeavors to avoid receiving representations from the European Powers respecting the introduction of reforms in Turkey. The Russian and Austrian Embassadors at Constantinople have assumed a decided tone on this subject, thus demonstrating the complete harmony of the two Powers in their attitude toward the Porte.

LONDON, Saturday, Jan. 15, 1876.

The Times, in an editorial article to-day, says the British Cabinet will consider the answer to the Austrian note next Tuesday. *The Times* strongly advises acceptance, and says Turkey's answer may depend on England's decision.

A special dispatch from Vienna to *The Standard* says the Austrian Foreign Office is confident that England will assent to Count Andrassy's note. The *Wiener Presse* reports that Lord Derby recently expressed dissatisfaction to Count von Beust, the Austrian Embassador at London, because England had not been asked to assist in drawing up the proposals for reforms in Turkey instead of being merely requested to indorse them.

The same dispatch reports that the Montenegrin Government has bought 50 cannon and 10,000 muskets in Vienna.

A Vienna telegram in *The Post* reports serious differences among the insurgent leaders in Herzegovina. Ljubobratics has quitted the insurgent camp with a number of his followers and gone to Ragusa.

THE SPANISH MONARCHY.

MADRID, Friday, Jan. 14, 1876.

The Vatican has approved the appointment of Cardenas as Embassador to that Court.

Señor Sagasta's Committee have issued a protest against the pressure brought to bear by the provincial authorities upon electors.

The Carlist Committees are endeavoring to induce their partisans to renew the campaign in Catalonia, but their efforts meet with small success.

The *Diario* says the Government has received information that a vessel is preparing at Bordeaux to bring a cargo of contraband of war to Motrico for the Carlists.

FOREIGN NOTES.

Prince Bismarck's project for buying up all the railways in Germany meets with widespread opposition.

LONDON, Jan. 14.—A Cairo telegram to *The Daily Telegraph* says there have been important Egyptian successes in Abyssinia. The capture of Gen. Kirkham, an Englishman in the Abyssinian service, and two other English officers, has been reported here recently, but the news is not authentic.

The new Turkish commander in the Herzegovina, Ahmed Muhtar Pasha, is described as a bigoted Mussulman, who is anything but likely to favor a lenient policy towards the Christians. Up to the end of 1874 he was the Scheick ul Islam, or chief of the Ulemas—a sort of Turkish Pope—and it is believed that he was deprived of that dignity because he was opposed to the reforms proposed by the Government. His military abilities, says *The Eastern Budget*, are far from remarkable; and his most prominent quality is an obstinate aversion to all novelties in religion or politics.

AT THE STATE CAPITALS.

KENTUCKY SENATORSHIP.

MR. STEVENSON WITHDRAWS—A DISAPPOINTMENT TO MR. BECK—NO CHOICE.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

FRANKFORT, Ky., Jan. 14.—The two houses of the Kentucky General Assembly took the seventh and eighth joint ballots for United States Senator this morning. Previous to the balloting, the name of the Hon. J. W. Stevenson was withdrawn, and the Republicans nominated as their candidate the Hon. W. H. Wadsworth of Marysville. Considerable excitement was incident to the unexpected withdrawal of Senator Stevenson's name. Both the ballots resulted the same, as follows:

Whole number of votes	135
Necessary to a choice	68
James B. Beck received	47
John S. Williams	45
Preston H. Leslie	28
W. H. Wadsworth	15

Of the nineteen votes received by Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Williams got 9, Mr. Beck 7, Mr. Leslie 3. This was quite a surprise and a disappointment to Mr. Beck's friends, as he expected to get ten or twelve of Mr. Stevenson's votes. It now looks as if Mr. Williams has the lead in the race. A caucus has been called for to-night, to make a nomination for Senator on the part of the Democratic members.

LATER.—The caucus was called to order at 7 o'clock by Senator J. W. Hays, Chairman. The roll-call showed 12 Democratic members absent and 109 present, the most of those absent being Williams men. The first move was made by Representative Grigsby, to clear the House of all except Democratic members and the officers of the House. As the matter was so close between Mr. Beck and Mr. Williams, the Williams men began to filibuster to put off the caucus until their full forces could be on hand to vote, and the Beck men endeavored to force action. The highest vote taken showed six men absent, and the lowest showed 37 absent. After a number of dilatory motions had been made and votes taken, the caucus adjourned to Monday evening. This was generally regarded as a test fight, as delay was regarded as fatal to Mr. Beck. The indications now are that unless some most remarkable change takes place a Senator will be chosen before Monday night arrives, and his name, it is generally conceded, is John S. Williams. The Williams men claim to-night that Mr. Leslie will be withdrawn to-morrow, and the Democratic vote will stand Mr. Williams, 61; Mr. Beck, 58; and that the Republican vote will then divide, and go 10 for Mr. Williams, and 5 for Mr. Beck, giving Mr. Williams 71 votes, and Mr. Beck 63 votes on the first ballot.

LOUISIANA.

THE MILITARY TO GO TO FELICIANA PARISHES—GOV. KELLOGG REFUSES CREDENTIALS TO EUSTIS.

NEW-ORLEANS, Jan. 14.—After a long debate to-day in the Senate a resolution was passed providing that the Governor shall send the militia to the Parishes of East Feliciana, West Feliciana, and East Baton Rouge, to assist the courts in executing the laws against the so called regulators. If the militia is insufficient the Governor is requested to report to the Legislature, the latter to call upon the President of the United States to restore a republican form of government in said parishes.

A House Committee called upon Gov. Kellogg to-day to inform him of the election of Senator James B. Eustis to the United States Senate, and requested him to issue the necessary credentials. The Governor answered that having already issued credentials to Senator Pinchback, he could not issue them to another gentleman for the same position. He declared himself, however, willing to certify to the proceedings of the House relative to Eustis's election. The Committee reported this to the House.

THE COUNCIL ABANDONED.

BREAKING UP OF NEGOTIATIONS.

A PROTEST FROM PLYMOUTH CHURCH—THE PARTICIPATION OF THE CHURCHES OF DRS. STORRS AND BUDINGTON OBJECTED TO—THE TWO PASTORS DECLINE TO TAKE PART—MRS. MOULTON'S POSITION—MR. BEECHER EMPHATICALLY DEFENDS THE ACTION OF PLYMOUTH CHURCH—THE ADVISORY COUNCIL TO REVIEW THE NEGOTIATIONS.

The plan of a Mutual Council to consider the questions at issue between Plymouth Church and Mrs. Moulton has been practically abandoned. Mr. Beecher's church protested against any participation in the Council on the part of the Clinton Avenue Church and the Church of the Pilgrims, while Mrs. Moulton's counsel insisted that his client had the right to secure their presence and advice. Plymouth Church refused to withdraw its protest, and on account of it, Drs. Storrs and Buddington declined to share in the deliberations of the Council. Plymouth Church last evening resolved to ask the Advisory Council, which it will call, to consider its course in the negotiations with Mrs. Moulton's representative, and to point out any error that there might be in its action.

THE CHECK TO THE PREPARATIONS.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH DRS. STORRS AND BUDINGTON—THEIR WITHDRAWAL OF ASSENT—PLYMOUTH ABIDES BY ITS PROTEST—MR. VAN COTT'S REMONSTRANCE.

The various conferences which have been held during the past two weeks between the Committee of the Plymouth Church and Joshua M. Van Cott, counsel for Mrs. Emma C. Moulton, relative to the completion of the letter-missive for the Mutual Council, have been closed. It has been known for several days that the main question of discussion in these conferences was in regard to the churches which should be invited to participate in the council. It has been stated on several occasions that there were only a few churches concerning which there was any doubt, and members of Plymouth Church have often expressed confidence that everything would be arranged in a day or two. Early yesterday afternoon, before the letters given below had been sent to him, Mr. Shearman said he believed the full list of churches would be made known at the meeting last evening, but that the whole matter rested with Mr. Van Cott.

The belief has gained ground within a few days that the question of inviting the churches of Drs. Storrs and Budington was the cause of the delay in the completion of the letter-missive. And a well-known Congregational clergyman, residing in Brooklyn, said yesterday early in the day that there was something in these negotiations which the public did not yet know, but which would come out in a few days. He also said he did not believe the Mutual Council would ever be held. It now appears that among the churches which Mrs. Moulton determined to invite were those of Drs. Storrs and Budington. The following is a copy of the note which was sent to these pastors and to those of other churches whom it was proposed by both parties to invite:

BROOKLYN, Jan. 4, 1876.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: Plymouth Church, represented by its Committee, and Mrs. Emma C. Moulton, represented by me, have agreed to a letter-missive for the call of a Mutual Council in Brooklyn, on the 25th of January, to advise the parties in answer to two questions they have agreed to submit. They have also agreed upon the churches and ministers to be invited to constitute the Council, and earnestly desire that their invitation shall be accepted. As the churches and ministers must all be named in the letter-missive, and as the parties wish that all proposed to be invited shall attend, we have agreed to make a preliminary inquiry of each as to their probable acceptance of the invitation; and each party has agreed to address a letter to a moiety of the churches and ministers agreed upon, asking for information on that point. It is our wish that the Council shall be composed of the representatives of 20 prominent churches, and of 10 ministers not representing churches.

In pursuance of this arrangement, I address this communication to you and respectfully ask whether ——— will probably comply with the earnest wish of the parties, in response to the letter-missive to be sent. As an early day is fixed for the Council a prompt reply to this by telegram (or by letter if more convenient to you) to my address, will greatly oblige us. With Christian regards, very truly yours, JOSHUA M. VAN COTT,
54 William-st., New-York City.

To this letter Drs. Storrs and Budington replied that they had no doubt of the willingness of their people to send delegates to the Council. As soon as Plymouth Church was informed that these churches had been invited a protest was made. The Rev. Drs. Budington and Storrs then addressed letters to Mr. Van Cott, withdrawing the assent they had formerly expressed. Following are the letters:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1876.

The Hon. J. M. VAN COTT.—DEAR SIR: When you inquired of me if the church of which I am pastor would accept an invitation to the Mutual Council, consented to by the Plymouth Church, I had no doubt of their willingness to do so, as I regard it as one of the duties involved in the fellowship of churches to accept such invitation when called for important purposes, and in a regular manner. I have since heard from you, however, that the Committee of the Plymouth Church have protested against the calling of the Clinton Avenue Church, and in view of this fact, so unexampled in the history of mutual councils, and so unjust in its implications, I feel compelled to withdraw the acquiescence I expressed, and to say that I think the Clinton Avenue Church would not accept the invitation under these circumstances, as I certainly should not for myself. Very respectfully yours,
WM. IVES BUDINGTON.

DR. STORRS'S WITHDRAWAL OF ASSENT.

80 PIERREPONT-ST., BROOKLYN, N. Y., Jan. 12, 1876.

MY DEAR SIR: When you asked me the other day in regard to my willingness and the probable willingness of the Church of the Pilgrims to take part in the Mutual Council proposed to be called by Plymouth Church and Mrs. Moulton, I replied that if the invitation were a cordial one from both parties, as I understood it to be, I should be ready to accept it, and I presumed that the church would be also; and that whatever aid we could give in the adjustment of the matters to be brought before the Council would be cheerfully given. But now that the Committee of the Plymouth Church, as I understand you, have entered a protest against our being invited to the Council, I beg to say that I certainly could not attend myself, and I have a very strong impression that the church would at once decline any invitation to take part in it.

I do not wish to evade any duty, but I cannot think that duty would require either the church or myself to accept an invitation overshadowed, and practically nullified as this one has been. So you will please consider my expressions of assent, made to you the other day, as wholly withdrawn.

Very truly, and with great regard, yours,
The Hon. JOSHUA M. VAN COTT. R. S. STORRS.

On the receipt of these letters Mr. Van Cott had a consultation with Mrs. Moulton, and prepared the following letter to the Committee of Plymouth Church which was received yesterday:

BROOKLYN, Jan. 13, 1876.

The Rev. EDWARD BEECHER, *D. D.*, THOMAS G. SHEARMAN, *esq., and others, Committee of Plymouth Church.*

GENTLEMEN: I last evening received the note of Mr. Tilney, the Clerk of your church, in which he says: "The Committee of Plymouth Church desire me to inform you that they cannot change their position in the matter of the protest;" and adds that "they are ready at once to sign the letter-missive, either with or without the changes suggested respecting the churches to be called." I must accept this action of the Committee as the act of Plymouth Church until it is disaffirmed by the church; and so must regard it as the final decision of the church respecting the protest interposed by its committee. * * *

In accordance with the venerable usage of the Congregational order, you named one moiety of the churches and ministers to be invited; and I named the other moiety on the evening of the 3d of January. As we mutually desired the council to be full, we, on the same evening, agreed that letters should be sent to the churches and ministers named by us respectively, asking an answer as to the probability of their acceptance of the invitation, when sent by a letter-missive (the tenor of which had been agreed upon by us), and we adjourned to the 7th of January, when we were to communicate the answers received. I promptly mailed my letters to the churches and ministers I had named. My letters were of a uniform tenor, and carefully avoided any intimation of the party by whom the church or minister had been chosen. We met on the evening of the 7th of January, and I then announced to you that I had heard from all except the most remote church, and all but one minister, and that the answers received were in the affirmative except from one church in Massachusetts. You thus distinctly understood that the Church of the Pilgrims and the Clinton Avenue Church would probably "accept" the invitation as cordially invited to be a part of the council. After I had made this announcement you read a written protest that you had previously prepared (and of which you then gave me a copy) protesting against these two churches being invited. I made instant answer that the protest violated the fundamental principle of a mutual council, violated the arrangement by which we had each named a moiety of the churches and ministers to be invited; violated the arrangement pursuant to which I had written to all the churches and ministers that I had named, and that you had assented to; and that if such a protest were ever admissible in such a case it had been made too late.

On the evening of Jan. 10 we again met. I asked that your protest might be withdrawn. Denying your right to protest, and disclaiming any validity of any counter-protest on my part, I then provisionally read a counter-protest against four churches named by you, and gave you a copy of it. You then stated that one of the churches named in my counter-protest could not attend the council because of the illness of its pastor. After our meeting adjourned, and late in the evening, I received a communication from your committee, signed by Mr. Tilney as clerk, proposing to withdraw the names of the four churches named in my counter-protest (one of which had already declined), if I would withdraw the names of the two churches against whom you had protested, to wit, the Church of the Pilgrims and the Clinton Avenue Church. The next morning I notified you that I would communicate my answer on the 12th of January. Before the 12th I had received an official copy of the resolutions by which the Central Church of Brooklyn had declined the proposed invitation.

As I had, pursuant to our mutual arrangement, sent provisional invitations to the pastors of the Church of the Pilgrims and the Clinton Avenue Church, I could not, without a gross breach of courtesy and placing myself in a false position, consider the question of withdrawing these churches without communicating your protest to their pastors and asking what their churches would probably do if invited after notification of your protest. Before receiving a definitive answer from them, I, on the afternoon of the 12th of January, met Mr. Shearman as your representative, and, after recounting the foregoing facts, told him I was shut up to the choice of one of three alternatives, as to which I could come to no positive decision until I had heard from the pastors of the two churches you had protested against. These alternatives were: First, to adhere to the churches protested against, with the serious risk that the protest would prevent their acceptance of an invitation to the council; second, to waive those churches and name substitutes; third, to insist that Plymouth Church, having in form agreed to a mutual council, and in fact assented to my selection of churches and ministers to be invited, and made it my duty to send inquiries as to the probability of their accepting an invitation to the council, its subsequent protest subverted the fundamental idea of a mutual council, and in effect refused and defeated what it had agreed to; and that if its protest was not withdrawn, Mrs. Moulton might be constrained to refuse to go further, and make public the reasons for her refusal. I at the same time informed Mr. Shearman that if you would withdraw your protest I would withdraw my counter protest and would instantly name a church in place of the Central Church, and procure Mrs. Moulton's signature to the letter-missive. Mr. Shearman retired, promising a written answer from the Committee. In the evening, I received your communication, over the signature of Mr. Tilney, in which you say your Committee "cannot change their position in the matter of the protest." Before I had received your final refusal to withdraw the protest, the pastors of the Church of the Pilgrims and of the Clinton Avenue Church had notified me, that they would not, and were of the opinion that their respective churches would not, accept an invitation to come to the council coupled with a protest against their coming.

THE EFFECT OF PLYMOUTH'S PROTEST.

Without scrutiny and without criticism Mrs. Moulton had acquiesced in your selection of churches and ministers named by Plymouth Church. Plymouth Church, by a subtle evasion of her right of equal choice, has practically overruled her selection, and thus excluded from the proposed council two of the most prominent and weighty churches of their denomination, and among the very oldest and most representative of the Congregational churches out of New-England. Plymouth Church, to be sure, offers a formal consent to their coming to the council, but couples with the consent a protest that nullifies it, and precludes the coming of self-respecting churches, with the certain additional effect of causing the refusal of other churches named by her to come to a council from which leading local churches have thus been excluded. The crafty contrivance of a protest which thus practically excludes two leading churches may be indefinitely extended to the exclusion of every great church, and of every minister most eminent for character and wisdom in the denomination. It palpably violates the right of free and equal choice, which rests upon obvious principles of justice and established, uniform, and venerable usage of the church. If sanctioned, it puts an end to mutual councils, the one strong body of unity of the collective Congregational communion; and Mrs. Moulton will not, by her acquiescence, raise such an abuse into a dangerous precedent. Besides, a contest between a feeble woman and a powerful church is unequal enough, without giving to that church the power to select one-half of a council, and also the power to exclude from the other half any churches and all ministers whom it is pleased by its protest to denounce as inimical and partial. As the facts show, such a double power of selection and exclusion has been practically and effectively exerted by Plymouth Church in this case. Consent has not disarmed the protest, but the protest has nullified and rendered valueless the consent. Thus denied her right, and prevented by a shrewd device from having an equal and just representation in a mutual council, Mrs. Moulton declines to continue her abortive effort to convene such a council.

* * * * * * * * *

If, in finally excluding her, the church assumed that her professed belief in the guilt of her pastor was insincere, it was an assumption the church had no right to make; and it was her right to vindicate her sincerity by producing the proofs, by her believed to be cogent and irresistible, to substantiate the facts which had impressed her mind with an intense conviction. She challenged inquiry, she desired a trial, she was ready to furnish her proofs. Besides the great body of facts adduced on the trial in court, which had produced a conviction of the guilt of the pastor upon many of the sincerest and best minds of the country, she was ready to produce other convincing proofs excluded by the technical rules in a court of law, but relevant, competent, and persuasive in a court of conscience. Denied by Plymouth Church an opportunity to produce this new evidence, she desired an opportunity to take the judgment of a council upon its sufficiency to justify her conviction of the truth of the charges against the pastor. Driven from Plymouth Church without a trial, was it not her right to ask the judgment and the conscience of the best minds of the churches whether she had not been unjustly deprived of her place within the fold of Christ?

If it is said that the evidence of the pastor's guilt, however cogent to her mind, and however convincing to thousands of thoughtful minds sincerely seeking after truth, did not justify her absence from the ministry and sacraments of Plymouth Church, and that she was excluded for that reason, I submit that that raises a very grave question for the advice of a great council, and that question she desired a council to answer. Can the proposition be maintained that a female church member, who upon cogent evidence absolutely convincing to her mind believes her pastor to have been guilty of adultery, of tricky devices to prevent its exposure, and then of perjury to escape its penalty, is bound to go to that pastor for religious instructions, and to receive the sacraments of the Church from his hands? May he break the bread for her and give her the cup at the Supper of the Lord, whether she will or no? Must he lay his hands upon the head of her children consecrated in baptism, and administer the last consolations to her dying, and perform for her the last offices of the dead? And must she, if sincerely believing in his guilt, be a consenting party to such a horrible mummery and hypocrisy? I do not discuss the question whether the pastor was guilty, but I affirm that she was sincere in believing that he was, and offered to show cogent reasons for her belief; and that if she sincerely believed him to be guilty, upon proofs having a just tendency to prove his guilt, she was justified in acting upon her conviction in rejecting him as her religious teacher, and in refusing to receive the sacrament from his hands. So it seems to her, and she desired the weighty advice of a Council upon that question as to her religious duty.

* * * * * * * * *

I am instructed by Mrs. Moulton to say that she reaffirms the charges made in her written protest before Plymouth Church, the sincerity and intensity of her belief in their truth, and her readiness to produce ample evidence to justify her belief and her conduct. She is willing to be judged by the public opinion of the world, which is usually right at last, and by that final judgment in which there will be no admixture of human error.

I with pleasure express my sense of the mutual courtesy that has marked our interviews. Most respectfully yours, JOSHUA M. VAN COTT.

THE PLYMOUTH CHURCH MEETING.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE—REVIEW OF THE CONFERENCES AND NEGOTIATIONS—A QUESTION FOR THE ADVISORY COUNCIL—AN EARNEST ADDRESS BY MR. BEECHER—HIS OPINION OF MRS. MOULTON AND DRS. STORRS AND BUDINGTON.

Just before the benediction was pronounced at the prayer-meeting of Plymouth Church last evening, Mr. Beecher said there would be a business meeting for the purpose of hearing the report of the Committee concerning the Mutual Council. The entire congregation, which filled every part of the lecture-room, remained. Mr. Beecher said the Committee were still engaged at their report in Mr. Shearman's house, but they would probably be present soon. He then spoke as follows:

The brethren are aware that now for several weeks a committee of this church, appointed by this church, have been in conference with Mrs. Moulton, through her representative lawyer, with reference to a Mutual Council. The negotiations have been conducted amicably, but for various reasons—of which an account will be given to-night, probably—they have been delayed from time to time, and we have received to-day a last document from Judge Van Cott, in which they decline and throw up the Mutual Council entirely. [Applause.] Hush! Of course you know nothing about the facts, and it is not proper that you should even express a pedal judgment. [Laughter.] Of course in breaking away from this Mutual Council, it is supposed to be the policy of the adversary to throw the blame entirely upon Plymouth Church—that poor camel in the desert of Congregationalism, that is obliged to carry such heavy loads of blame, without water or food, across such an arid waste. Of course, a little more or less don't make any difference, and now we shall be accused of being so naughty that they could not go on with the Mutual Council, although we have not declined it, nor insisted upon any conditions that were not eminently just, nor did we make any conditions that we said we would not waive; but we only contended that these conditions should be considered. I may state in addition that since this Council—which I never believed was seriously offered, which I always believed was merely offered because they thought it necessary on the way to an *ex parte* council (a council of which they should call all the members, and state their own call in their own way)—this Council is being now declined not by this church, that has been willing and is willing to go in, but wholly and absolutely by those that called for it. Of course there cannot be an *ex parte* Council except by men who would stultify themselves in Congregational usage in its very elements, but it makes it imperative in us to call the Advisory Council, which we adjourned in deference to the Mutual Council, and we shall proceed at once to issue letters-missive for the Advisory Council, to be composed of men of such unquestionable integrity and moral worth that there

See Seventh Page.

ALBANY.

GEO. D. LORD'S TRIAL.

SOME OF ITS PICTURESQUE FEATURES—BUFFALO PICKETED TO INFLUENCE THE JURORS—ABSOLUTELY NO DEFENSE LEFT TO LORD—HIS DEJECTION—THE JUDGE'S TERRIBLE CHARGE—TWO OBSTINATE JURORS.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

ALBANY, Jan. 14.—The great personal and political influence of the Lord family, in their section of the State, has sufficed not only to keep one of them out of the State Prison, but to keep from the public the inner history of the way this apparent fraud on justice was accomplished. A gentleman who has just returned from Buffalo, and watched carefully the whole of the trial, gives me some interesting incidents in connection with it. His statements I know to be entirely trustworthy. As one of the first expedients, Prince George, as this great, brawny chief of the Canal Ring is called, had a swarm of men in Buffalo watching the arrivals at every little tavern in the city, so as to find and, if possible, make sure of the incoming farmers who had been summoned on the jury. The poll numbered 300, and with all the efforts of these men the greatest difficulty was experienced in obtaining a jury, because almost every one seemed to have made up his mind that Lord was guilty. Several said that no evidence could change their opinion; they knew he was guilty. However, in the jury that was finally selected, the event proved that there were two who, for some good reason, had made up their minds to vote for Lord's acquittal, first and last.

About the trial itself there were two things remarkable. The first was that much of the important testimony for the prosecution was extracted from unwilling witnesses—Thaddeus C. Davis and Wm. H. Bowman, Lord's counsel, and the Canal Commissioners who made the first award, John D. Fay, William W. Wright, and George W. Chapman—all of whom seemed badly frightened, and did much painful shuffling and turning. The second was that the defense which had been prearranged broke down completely. John Riley, who was Lord's dummy in the contract with Hand for getting the bill through the Legislature for which Lord voted, was to go upon the stand and swear away all Lord's part in the transaction, showing himself as the principal in the case. But his courage failed him. Though he was subpenaed by the prosecution, they were compelled to get out an attachment for him in order to keep him in court. One of the lawyers of the prosecution said privately that he wanted Riley to hear the testimony. The device worked well. Riley, during the testimony of a witness whose forehead was covered with great beads of fear, himself exhibited the utmost trepidation, and at the adjournment of the Court disappeared. He did not return, and the defense announced that they would take the responsibility of not calling him. This broke the backbone of the defense. There was absolutely nothing left of it. They did endeavor to prove that the bargain between Lord and Hand was made before the opening of the term of the Legislature—a point about which the prosecution cared nothing; and they did call various battered and broken down members of the Legislature of 1871, such as Loran L. Lewis, H. B. Ransom, the notorious lobbyist and ex-member, Francis S. Thayer, until recently a large dealer in State certificates in this city, who lately went into official bankruptcy. These worthies, and others like them, all testified that Lord never asked them to vote for the bill; but when it was found that Tweed and Jarvis Lord in the Senate, and Thomas C. Fields in the Assembly, the latter the only other man ever indicted under the same act under which Lord was being tried, were conspicuous friends of the bill, this point seems less pointed.

The last day of the trial Lord's bravado seemed to have given out. He wept and grew more and more melancholy as Judge Daniels's charge proceeded. This charge was the heaviest assault which Lord had to undergo. While marked with the utmost fairness and suavity, it was terrible in the way in which every aspect told against the prisoner. Almost every time Lord's counsel called the attention of the Court to certain portions of the testimony which in their opinion were favorable to their side, it seemed only to remind the Judge of some other point connected with it which weighed much heavier the other way. Yet there was not so much as a suspicion of unfairness in his rulings.

After the jury had gone out the suspense of Lord and his friends was marked. Perhaps they began to be doubtful of their jurors, in the face of the overwhelming evidence, but the talk of his friends was to the effect that it was not right to send him to the State Prison. The public mind had undergone a great change in the past four years. The things looked very differently in 1875 from 1871. A fine ought to be enough. Their anxiety about the jurors was misplaced. It is said that the two who held out to the last, and were believed to have been in communication with one Wiley, a well-known Albany lobbyist and ex-member, refused to discuss the matter with their associates, and silently voted for acquittal from the start, carrying with them a third juryman who would have voted guilty if these two had done so. The remaining nine were solid for a verdict of guilty from the first ballot.

No sooner was the failure to agree announced than Attorney-General Fairchild was on his feet calling for a new trial to begin that very day. "O, no!" said Lord's counsel; "we have other things to attend to." "No, Sir," said Mr. Fairchild; "we have this to attend to, and I propose to go on." Judge Daniels was unable, however, to continue; but the new trial will begin in three weeks, and, if there is a disagreement, another will follow that. Mr. Fairchild said the other day to a friend that he proposed to go on with the case until Lord was either convicted or acquitted, if it took half a dozen trials to do it. Meanwhile all the corruptible residents of Erie County are doubtless being corrupted in anticipation of the next jury. If this man escapes, it will be a lasting reproach to our courts and our laws. There has never been before in this State an opportunity to convict a man of bribery on the evidence of his own written agreement to be bribed, and it ought not to be lost. To see George D. Lord in convict dress, earning forty-two cents a day for the State, would be a moral lesson to the rogues sharper than a hundred messages or newspaper exposures. Neither he nor the rest of these men can be reached in any other way. They have no social position to lose, and are are incapable of shame. What they do fear is the harsh touch of a prison suit.

UNEXPECTED RESIGNATION.

INSURANCE SUPERINTENDENT CHAPMAN GIVES UP HIS OFFICE FOR THE SAKE OF HIS PROFESSION.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

ALBANY, N. Y., Jan. 14.—Superintendent of Insurance Chapman announced to the Governor's secretary to-day his intention of resigning his office, to take effect Jan. 31. His term expired in November last, but under the provision of the law that the Superintendent holds office until his successor has been nominated and confirmed he has remained in the place until now, and doubtless might have continued, in the political dead-lock between the Governor and the Senate, for the remainder of the year. Mr. Chapman takes this step without any intention of embarrassing the Governor, with whom his relations have always been of the pleasantest kind, but because he has found it necessary to make his choice between an office and his profession, and has chosen the latter notwithstanding the desire of his party friends that he should remain. Under the Revised Statutes the Deputy Superintendent of Insurance, Mr. Smyth, will hold over until the confirmation of Mr. Chapman's successor. In case of a disagreement between

See Seventh Page.